

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

Claims 1, 14, and 20 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. The Examiner stated essentially, the a step of providing RFID tags to all potential spectators is necessary in order to enable the claims.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's comments related to this rejection.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "updating a plurality of device parameters, wherein at least one device parameter is updated in response to detecting of one of a radio frequency identification tag and an infrared tag; triggering at least one rule of the plurality of rules by the plurality of device parameters; executing the at least one triggered rule for causing the display of the content on the display device in response to the detection of the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag be detected." Claim 14 claims, *inter alia*, "executing each rule satisfied by the device parameters, wherein the execution is in response to detecting at least one of a radio frequency identification tag and an infrared tag; displaying content according to each satisfied rule, wherein a first satisfied rule specifies that the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag be detected and a second satisfied rule specifies a certain demographic determined based on a product associated with the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag." Claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, "executing a triggered rule for causing the display of

the content on the display device, wherein the triggered rule specifies that the spectator be detected, wherein the spectator is detected by a receiver which detects the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag provided to the spectator.”

Each of Claims 1, 14 and 20 claim a method for detecting one of a radio frequency identification tag and an infrared tag and executing a rule based on the detection. Claims 1 and 14 claim detecting a tag - spectators have been deleted from the claims. Claim 20 claims providing a spectator with the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag and detecting the same. Accordingly, the claims are believed to satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 13-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cohen (USPN 6,060,993). The Examiner stated essentially that Cohen teaches all the limitations of Claims 1-9 and 13-21.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, “displaying the content according to the triggered rule, wherein no content is displayed when no device parameter indicates the detection of one of the radio frequency identification tag and the infrared tag.” Claim 14 claims, *inter alia*, “executing each rule satisfied by the device parameters, wherein the execution is in response to detecting at least one of a radio frequency identification tag and an infrared tag; displaying content according to each satisfied rule, wherein a first satisfied rule specifies that the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag be detected and a second satisfied rule specifies a certain demographic determined based on a product associated with the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag.” Claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, “executing a triggered rule for causing the display of the content on the display device, wherein the triggered rule specifies that the

spectator be detected, wherein the spectator is detected by a receiver which detects the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag provided to the spectator.”

Referring to Claim 1; Cohen teaches a method for display advertisements according to zone, date, time, and weather (see col. 4, lines 47-53 and col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 3). Cohen does not teach “displaying the content according to the triggered rule, wherein no content is displayed when no device parameter indicates the detection of one of the radio frequency identification tag and the infrared tag” as claimed in Claim 1. Cohen teaches a method for varying the display of content based on geography and weather. Cohen does not teach that no content is displayed in the where no tag is detected, teach that the detection of a radio frequency identification tag or infrared tag satisfies a rule for the display of content. If a current message is not valid for a given parameter, such as, a zone, a new message is selected (see col. 4, lines 54 to col. 5, line 3). Nowhere does Cohen teach that no message is displayed, much less that no message is displayed where no tag is detected. Therefore, Cohen fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 1.

Referring to Claim 14; Cohen teaches a method for displaying advertisements according to date, time, and weather (see col. 4, lines 47-53 and col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 3). Cohen does not teach “displaying content according to each satisfied rule, wherein a first satisfied rule specifies that the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag be detected and a second satisfied rule specifies a certain demographic determined based on a product associated with the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag” as claimed in Claim 14. Cohen teaches the detection the proximity of other stations, that is, detecting the proximity of other vehicles displaying the same messages in a particular zone (see col. 5, lines 10-14). Proximity is not an indication of a demographic of a product. Thus, Cohen does not teach the display of content

according to a certain demographic determined based on a product associated with the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag, essentially as claimed in Claim 14. Therefore, Cohen fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 14.

Referring to Claim 20; Cohen teaches a method for displaying advertisements according to date, time, and weather (see col. 4, lines 47-53 and col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 3). Cohen does not teach “executing a triggered rule for causing the display of the content on the display device, wherein the triggered rule specifies that the spectator be detected, wherein the spectator is detected by a receiver which detects the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag provided to the spectator” as claimed in Claim 20. Cohen teaches detecting the proximity of other vehicles displaying the same messages in a particular zone (see col. 5, lines 10-14) using a GPS receiver (see col. 4, lines 43-46). The GPS receiver is not analogous to a radio frequency identification tag or infrared tag provided to a spectator. For example, the GPS system operates world wide, thus, detection is meaningless for purposes of displaying content. Thus, Cohen does not teach “executing a triggered rule for causing the display of the content on the display device, wherein the triggered rule specifies that the spectator be detected, wherein the spectator is detected by a receiver which detects the radio frequency identification tag or the infrared tag provided to the spectator” as claimed in Claim 20. Therefore, Cohen fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 20.

Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1. Claims 15-19 depend from Claim 14. Claim 21 depends from Claim 20. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1, 14, and 21. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen. The Examiner stated essentially that Cohen teaches or suggests all the limitations of Claims 10 and 11.

Claims 10-12 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1-21, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 7, 2007

/Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889